arXiv:1410.1224v3 [math.LO] 1 Apr 2015

FORCING A COUNTABLE STRUCTURE TO BELONG TO THE GROUND MODEL

ITAY KAPLAN AND SAHARON SHELAH

Abstract. Suppose that P is a forcing notion, L is a language (in $\mathbb{V}$), $\dot{\tau}$ a P-name such that $P \Vdash$ "$\dot{\tau}$ is a countable L-structure". In the product $P \times P$, there are names $\dot{\tau}_1, \dot{\tau}_2$ such that for any generic filter $G = G_1 \times G_2$ over $P \times P$, $\dot{\tau}_1[G] = \dot{\tau}[G_1]$ and $\dot{\tau}_2[G] = \dot{\tau}[G_2]$. Zapletal asked whether or not $P \times P \Vdash \dot{\tau}_1 \cong \dot{\tau}_2$ implies that there is some $M \in \mathbb{V}$ such that $P \Vdash \dot{\tau} \cong \check{M}$. We answer this question negatively and discuss related issues.

1. The isomorphism property

Let us start with describing the motivating question (asked by Zapletal) for this paper.

Let P_1, P_2 be forcing notions, and let L be a language (vocabulary) such that both P_1 and P_2 force L to be countable. Suppose that $\dot{\tau}_1$, $\dot{\tau}_2$ are, respectively, P_1 and P_2 names for countable L structures whose universe, we may assume, is ω. We also fix our universe $\mathbb{V}$.

Let $\dot{\tau}'_1$ be a name in the forcing notion $P_1 \times P_2$ such that for any generic filter $G = G_1 \times G_2$ for $P_1 \times P_2$, $\dot{\tau}'_1[G] = \dot{\tau}_1[G_1]$, and similarly define $\dot{\tau}'_2$.

($\star$) Suppose that $P_1 \times P_2 \Vdash \dot{\tau}'_1 \cong \dot{\tau}'_2$. Does it follow that for some L-structure $M \in \mathbb{V}$, $P_1 \Vdash \dot{\tau}_1 \cong \check{M}$?

First we make a few remarks.

$*$ Note that even if $\dot{\tau}_1$ is forced to be a finite structure, it is not immediate that the answer is "yes". Here's an example where we can force a new structure with finite universe. Let $L = \{P_i \mid i < \omega\}$ where P_i are unary predicates. Let P be the Cohen forcing adding one new real $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{V}^P$. Then in $\mathbb{V}^P$, we can define the structure N whose universe is $\{0\}$, and such that $P_i^N = \emptyset$ iff $\varepsilon(i) = 0$. However, it turns out that in this case the answer is "yes" in our situation by Remark 2.8 below, so for simplicity we will focus on infinite structures.

$*$ Note also that if the answer to ($\star$) is yes, then if $P_2 \Vdash \left|\check{M}\right| = \aleph_0$, then also $P_2 \Vdash \dot{\tau}_2 \cong \check{M}$. Indeed, suppose that G_2 is a P_2-generic filter over $\mathbb{V}$, and that G_1 is P_1-generic over $\mathbb{V}[G_2]$. Then

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03C95, 03C55, 03C45.

This research was partially supported by the ISRAEL SCIENCE FOUNDATION (grant No. 1533/14).

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council, ERC Grant Agreement n. 338821. No. 1054 on the second author's list of publications.

After this paper was published online, it came to our attention, thanks to Antonio Montalban, that another paper released recently [KMS14] has some similar results. See Remark 5.17 for more.

$G_1 \times G_2$ is $P_1 \times P_2$-generic (see [Jec03, Lemma 15.9]) over $\mathbb{V}$, so $\mathbb{V}[G_1 \times G_2] \models \dot{\tau}_2 \cong \check{M}$. But in $\mathbb{V}[G_2]$, the set of pairs (x, y) of elements of ω^ω which code isomorphic L-structure is analytic (i.e., $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1$), and analytic properties are absolute between transitive models of ZFC by Mostowski's absoluteness (see [Jec03, Theorem 25.4]), so this is true in $\mathbb{V}[G_2]$ as well. Another way to see this is using Scott sentences, see Remark 2.7.

$*$ Finally let us note that we can reduce the question to the case where $P_1 = P_2$. Consider $P_1 \times P_2 \times P_1$, and, abusing notation, let $\dot{\tau}'_1, \dot{\tau}'_2$ be $P_1 \times P_2 \times P_1$-names as above, and let $\dot{\tau}''_1$ be a $P_1 \times P_2 \times P_1$-name such that for any generic filter $G = G_1 \times G_2 \times G_3$ for $P_1 \times P_2 \times P_1$, $\dot{\tau}''_1[G] = \dot{\tau}_1[G_3]$. Then $P_1 \times P_2 \times P_1 \Vdash \dot{\tau}'_1 \cong \dot{\tau}''_1$ (because for any such generic filter G, $G_1 \times G_2$ is $P_1 \times P_2$-generic and $G_2 \times G_3$ is $P_2 \times P_1$-generic). So for any generic filter $G = G_1 \times G_2 \times G_3$ for $P_1 \times P_2 \times P_1$, in $\mathbb{V}[G]$, $\dot{\tau}_1[G_1] \cong \dot{\tau}_1[G_3]$, and by Mostowski's absoluteness (see above), the same is true in $\mathbb{V}[G_1 \times G_3]$.

In order to simplify the discussion, let us introduce the following definition.

Definition 1.1. Suppose P is a forcing notion, L a language such that $P \Vdash \left|\check{L}\right| \leq \aleph_0$, and $\dot{\tau}$ is a P-name for an infinite L-structure with universe ω which satisfies:

- $P \times P \Vdash \dot{\tau}_1 \cong \dot{\tau}_2$ where $\dot{\tau}_1$ is a $P \times P$-names such that whenever $G = G_1 \times G_2$ is generic for $P \times P$, $\dot{\tau}_1[G] = \dot{\tau}[G]$ and $\dot{\tau}_2$ is defined similarly.

Then we say that $(P, L, \dot{\tau})$ has the *isomorphism property*.

In light of the remarks above, we will focus on the following question.

($\star'$) Suppose that $(P, L, \dot{\tau})$ has the isomorphism property. Does it follow that for some L-structure $M \in \mathbb{V}$, $P \Vdash \dot{\tau} \cong \check{M}$?

Let us say that a forcing notion P is *good* if the answer to ($\star'$) is "yes" for every L and $\dot{\tau}$. In Corollary 4.5 we give a more natural forcing theoretic description of such forcing notions: P is good iff P does not collapse $\aleph_2$ to $\aleph_0$.

Section 2 consists of three sub-sections, which mainly serve to recall classical results and to motivate the proceeding sections. In Section 2.1 we give the necessary facts about product of forcing notions. Section 2.2 discusses Scott sentences. Section 2.3 translates the Scott sentence of a structure M to a first order theory T such that M is an atomic model of T.

Section 3 translates ($\star'$) to a question on the existence of atomic models. Section 4 finally answers ($\star'$) negatively in full generality, but positively in some cases (e.g., when P does not collapse $\aleph_2$ to $\aleph_0$). In addition we investigate when atomic models exist under classification theory assumptions. In particular, we prove that if T is a superstable theory and A a subset of a model of T such that the isolated types over A are dense, then: if MA_κ holds, and $|A| \leq \kappa^+$, then there is an atomic model over A (this is Theorem 4.25). Without Martin's Axiom, this is not true (Example 4.12).

Section 5 deals with linear orders. Namely, we analyze the situation when $\dot{\tau}$ is forced to be a linear order. We do not reach a definite conclusion but we get some equivalent formulation of the problem.

Acknowledgement 1.2. We would like to thank the anonymous referee for his very thorough report and for his useful suggestions.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Some remarks on product forcing.** The following lemma is easy, and probably well known.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose $\mathbb{U}_1$ and $\mathbb{U}_2$ are both transitive models of ZFC such that $\mathbb{U}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{U}_2$. Suppose that $P \in \mathbb{U}_1$ is a forcing notion, $\dot{\tau} \in \mathbb{U}_1$ is a P-name, and $x \in \mathbb{U}_2$. Then, if $p \Vdash \dot{\tau} = \check{x}$ (in $\mathbb{U}_2$) for some $p \in P$, then $x \in \mathbb{U}_1$.*

Proof. We prove the lemma for any P, p, $\dot{\tau}$ and x by induction on β — the rank of x (β is the the smallest ordinal α such that $x \in \mathbb{U}_{2,\alpha+1}$). For $\beta = 0$ it is obvious. For $\beta > 0$, since $p \Vdash \dot{\tau} = \check{x}$, then for every $y \in x$, for some (actually for densely many) $q \in P$ stronger than p, there is some name $\dot{\tau}' \in \mathbb{U}_1$ ($\dot{\tau}'$ is a member of some pair — condition; name — in $\dot{\tau}$), such that $q \Vdash \dot{\tau}' = \check{y}$. By induction, $y \in \mathbb{U}_1$. So x is the set of y's in $\mathbb{U}_1$ such that $p \Vdash \check{y} \in \dot{\tau}$, and hence by specification, $x \in \mathbb{U}_1$. □

Corollary 2.2. *Suppose P_1, P_2 are forcing notions and that $\dot{\tau}_1, \dot{\tau}_2$ are P_1 and P_2-names respectively. As usual we let $\dot{\tau}_1'$ and $\dot{\tau}_2'$ be the corresponding names in the product. Then if $(p,q) \Vdash \dot{\tau}_1' = \dot{\tau}_2'$ for some $(p,q) \in P_1 \times P_2$, then for some $x \in \mathbb{V}$, $p \Vdash \dot{\tau}_1 = \check{x}$ and $q \Vdash \dot{\tau}_2 = \check{x}$.*

Proof. Let G_1 be a generic filter for P_1 over $\mathbb{V}$ containing p. Let $\mathbb{U}_1 = \mathbb{V}$, $\mathbb{U}_2 = \mathbb{V}[G_1]$, $P = P_2$, $\dot{\tau} = \dot{\tau}_2$ and $x = \dot{\tau}_1[G_1]$. So over $\mathbb{U}_2$, $q \Vdash \dot{\tau} = \check{x}$, and hence by Lemma 2.1, $x \in \mathbb{V}$. So $q \Vdash \dot{\tau}_2 = \check{x}$. Similarly, for some $x' \in \mathbb{V}$, $p \Vdash \dot{\tau}_1 = x'$. Finally, it must be that $x = x'$. □

Corollary 2.3. *Assume as above that P_1, P_2 are forcing notions and let $G_1 \times G_2$ be a $P_1 \times P_2$-generic filter. Then $\mathbb{V}[G_1] \cap \mathbb{V}[G_2] = \mathbb{V}$.*

Proof. Suppose that x is in the intersection. Let $\dot{\tau}_1$ and $\dot{\tau}_2$ be P_1 and P_2-names such that $\dot{\tau}_1[G_1] = \dot{\tau}_2[G_2]$, and let $\dot{\tau}_1'$ and $\dot{\tau}_2'$ be the corresponding $P_1 \times P_2$-names. Then for some $(p,q) \in G_1 \times G_2$, $(p,q) \Vdash \dot{\tau}_1' = \dot{\tau}_2'$. By Corollary 2.2, for some $x \in \mathbb{V}$, $p \Vdash \dot{\tau}_1 = \check{x}$ and $q \Vdash \dot{\tau}_2 = \check{x}$, so we are done. □

2.2. **Scott sentence.** Recall that for a countable structure M for a countable language, the *Scott sentence* of M is an $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-sentence Ψ such that whenever $N \models \Psi$ and $|N| = \aleph_0$, $N \cong M$.

We need a precise set theoretic definition and coding of $L_{\lambda,\omega}$-formulas in order to continue. As usually done, we can code formulas and terms as objects in $\mathbb{V}$. In the following paragraph, we do not distinguish between a formula (or term) and its code.

For instance, a code for a term is a variable $x \in Var$ (where Var is an infinite large enough set of variables) or a tuple $(f, t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ where f is an n-place function from L, and $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ are terms. Similarly we define codes for atomic formulas as tuples $(R, t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ where R is an n-place relation symbol and $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ are terms.

We also fix a constant set for the logical symbols $\neg, \bigwedge, \exists$. The code for the negation of an $L_{\lambda,\omega}$-formula $\neg\varphi$ is the pair $(\neg, \varphi)$, and similarly the code for $\exists x\varphi$ is $(\exists, x, \varphi)$. The code for $\bigwedge_{i\in I} \psi_i$ (where ψ_i are formulas, and $|I| < \lambda$) is the pair $(\bigwedge, \{\psi_i \mid i \in I\})$. The connectors $\bigvee$ and $\rightarrow$, and the quantifier $\forall$ are treated as abbreviations.

As usual, $L_{\infty,\omega}$ is the union of $L_{\lambda,\omega}$ running over all λ.

Remark 2.4. The property of being a (code for) $L_{\lambda,\omega}$-sentence for some λ is absolute. I.e., if $\mathbb{U}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{U}_2$ are transitive models of ZFC having the same ordinals, $x \in \mathbb{U}_1$, then $\mathbb{U}_1 \models$"x is an $L_{\infty,\omega}$-formula (sentence)" iff the same is true in $\mathbb{U}_2$. This can be proved by induction on the rank of x in $\mathbb{U}_1$.

The choice for the coding of $\bigwedge_{i\in I} \psi_i$ to be a set rather than a sequence is important as we shall see now: we give a canonical construction for Scott sentences as in e.g., [Kei71].

Proposition 2.5. *Suppose L is a countable language. There is a (class) function Sc whose domain is the class of all countable L-structures, and whose range is the set of all (codes for) $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$ sentences such that for all countable L-structures M, N, $M \cong N$ iff $N \models Sc(M)$ iff $Sc(M) = Sc(N)$.*

Proof. We repeat the construction from [Kei71]. Given a countable L-structure M, we define $Sc(M)$. By induction on $\alpha < \omega_1$, for every finite tuple $\bar{a} = (a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}) \in M^{<\omega}$, we define an $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-formula $\phi_{\alpha,\bar{a}}(\bar{x})$ with $\bar{x} = (x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ as follows:

For $\alpha = 0$, $\phi_{\alpha,\bar{a}}(\bar{x}) = \bigwedge \{\varphi(\bar{x}) \mid M \models \varphi(\bar{a}),\ \varphi \text{ atomic or a negation of an atomic formula}\}$.

For α limit, $\phi_{\alpha,\bar{a}}(\bar{x}) = \bigwedge \{\phi_{\beta,\bar{a}}(\bar{x}) \mid \beta < \alpha\}$.

For $\alpha = \beta + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{\alpha,\bar{a}}(\bar{x}) \quad = \quad & \phi_{\beta,\bar{a}}(\bar{x}) \wedge \\ & \forall x_{n+1} \bigvee \{\phi_{\beta,\bar{a}^\frown b}(\bar{x}, x_{n+1}) \mid b \in M\} \wedge \bigwedge \{\exists x_{n+1} \phi_{\beta,\bar{a}^\frown b}(\bar{x}, x_{n+1}) \mid b \in M\}.\end{aligned}$$

Now, one can prove by induction on $\alpha < \omega_1$ that $\bar{a} \models \phi_{\alpha,\bar{a}}(\bar{x})$. For some $\beta < \omega_1$, $M \models \forall\bar{x}(\phi_{\beta,\bar{a}}(\bar{x}) \rightarrow \phi_{\beta+1,\bar{a}}(\bar{x}))$ for all $\bar{a} \in M^{<\omega}$. Let $Sc(M)$ be

$$\phi_{\beta,\emptyset} \wedge \bigwedge \left\{\forall\bar{x}(\phi_{\beta,\bar{a}}(\bar{x}) \rightarrow \phi_{\beta+1,\bar{a}}(\bar{x})) \,\middle|\, \bar{a} \in M^{<\omega}\right\}.$$

By a back and forth argument as in [Kei71], if $N \models Sc(M)$ then $M \cong N$. In fact, if $\bar{a} \in M^{<\omega}$ and $\bar{b} \in N^{<\omega}$, and $M \models \phi_{\beta,\bar{c}}(\bar{a})$, $N \models \phi_{\beta,\bar{c}}(\bar{b})$ for some $\bar{c} \in M^{<\omega}$ of the same length as $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$, then there is an isomorphism between M and N taking $\bar{a}$ to $\bar{b}$.

For the other direction, suppose $f : M \to N$ is an isomorphism. It is easy to see by induction on $\alpha < \omega_1$ that for every $\bar{a} \in M^{<\omega}$, $\phi_{\alpha,\bar{a}} = \phi_{\alpha,f(\bar{a})}$ (in the induction step we rely on the choice of coding — as sets and not sequences). In particular, $Sc(M) = Sc(N)$. □

Proposition 2.6. *Assume that $(P, L, \dot{\tau})$ has the isomorphism property. Then there is an $L_{\infty,\omega}$-sentence Ψ in $\mathbb{V}$ such that $P \Vdash$ "$\check{\Psi}$ is the Scott sentence of $\dot{\tau}$". Furthermore, there is a complete first order theory $T \in \mathbb{V}$ in the language L such that $P \Vdash \check{T} = Th(\dot{\tau})$.*

Proof. Let $\dot{\Psi}$ be a name for $Sc(\dot{\tau})$ in P. Then $P \Vdash$"$\dot{\Psi}$ is an $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-sentence". Let $\dot{\Psi}_1$ and $\dot{\Psi}_2$ be $P \times P$-names such that for any generic $G = G_1 \times G_2$ for $P \times P$, $\dot{\Psi}_1[G] = \dot{\Psi}[G_1]$ and similarly for $\dot{\Psi}_2$. Then $P \times P \Vdash \dot{\Psi}_1 = \dot{\Psi}_2$ by Proposition 2.5. Hence by Corollary 2.2, for some $\Psi \in \mathbb{V}$, $P \Vdash \dot{\Psi} = \check{\Psi}$, so by Remark 2.4, Ψ is an $L_{\infty,\omega}$-sentence and we are done.

The furthermore part, regarding the first order theory, is proved similarly. □

Remark 2.7. In the slightly different context of Section 1, where we had two forcing notions P_1 and P_2 and two names $\dot{\tau}_1$ and $\dot{\tau}_2$, if $P_1 \times P_2 \Vdash \dot{\tau}'_1 \cong \dot{\tau}'_2$ and for some L-structure $M \in \mathbb{V}$, $P_1 \Vdash \dot{\tau}_1 \cong \check{M}$, then Proposition 2.6 gives another reason why in this case, if $P_2 \Vdash \left|\check{M}\right| = \aleph_0$, then also $P_2 \Vdash \dot{\tau}_2 \cong \check{M}$ (without using Mostowski's absoluteness). Why? as in the proof of said proposition, we can show that the Scott sentence Ψ of $\dot{\tau}_1$ (which is the same as the one of $\dot{\tau}_2$) is in $\mathbb{V}$. But then $M \models \Psi$ (in $\mathbb{V}$) so $P_2 \Vdash \check{M} \models \Psi$ and we are done by Proposition 2.5.

Remark 2.8. Why did we restrict to the case where the structures are infinite? if $(P, L, \dot{\tau})$ has the isomorphism property but $P \Vdash |\dot{\tau}| < \omega$, then the first order theory T in L which P forces to be $Th(\dot{\tau})$ is in $\mathbb{V}$ by Proposition 2.6. Hence T is a consistent first order theory in L, and hence has a model $M \in \mathbb{V}$. But now $P \Vdash \check{M} \equiv \dot{\tau}$, and as M is finite, they must be isomorphic.

2.3. **from a Scott sentence to a theory.** The outline for this subsection is as follows. First we show the well known result that an $L_{\lambda^+,\omega}$-sentence Ψ is "the same thing as" a first order theory T_Ψ and a collection of types to be omitted. We then show that when Ψ is a Scott sentence of a structure M, then in the language of T_Ψ, M is an atomic model of T^{co}_Ψ — the natural completion of T_Ψ. In the end of this section we remark that T^{co}_Ψ can be constructed directly from T_Ψ in an absolute way, without passing through M (hence, when M is constructed in some generic extension but Ψ is already in the ground model, then so is T^{co}_Ψ).

Lemma 2.9. *Suppose that Ψ is a consistent $L_{\lambda^+,\omega}$-sentence in the language L. Then there is a language L_Ψ, a consistent first order L_Ψ-theory T_Ψ of size $\leq \lambda$, a collection Γ_Ψ of partial T_Ψ-types and a canonical bijection H_Ψ which respects isomorphisms between the class of L-structures $M \models \Psi$ and the class of L_Ψ structures $N \models T_\Psi$ such that N omits all the types in Γ_Ψ.*

Proof. Recall that for an $L_{\infty,\omega}$ formula ψ, a sub-formula is an $L_{\infty,\omega}$ formula that appears in the construction of ψ. So for instance, sub-formulas of $\psi = \bigwedge \{\varphi_i \mid i \in I\}$ are ψ and sub-formulas of φ_i for all i, but not any conjunction $\bigwedge \{\varphi_i \mid i \in I'\}$ for $I' \subseteq I$.

We may assume that $|L| \leq \lambda$, by restricting to symbols which appear in Ψ. We may also assume that Ψ contains as sub-formulas all formulas of the form $P(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ and $F(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}) = x_n$ for every n-place relation symbol P and n-place function symbol F. Otherwise, we replace Ψ with $\Psi \wedge \varphi$ where φ is a big conjunction of sentences of the form $\forall \bar{x} (P(\bar{x}) \vee \neg P(\bar{x}))$ and $\forall \bar{x} \exists y F(\bar{x}) = y$.

Let L_Ψ be comprised of n-ary relation symbols R_φ for every sub-formula $\varphi(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ of Ψ (note that any sub-formula has a finite number of free variables as Ψ is a sentence). So $|L_\Psi| \leq \lambda$. The theory T_Ψ will have the axioms:

- $\exists x_n R_\varphi(x_0, \ldots, x_n) \leftrightarrow R_{\exists x_n \varphi}(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ whenever $\exists x_n \varphi(x_0, \ldots, x_n)$ is a sub-formula of Ψ.
- $\neg R_\varphi \leftrightarrow R_{\neg\varphi}$ whenever $\neg\varphi$ is a sub-formula of Ψ.
- $R_{\bigwedge\{\varphi_i \mid i \in I\}} \to R_{\varphi_i}$ for every $i \in I$ whenever $\bigwedge \{\varphi_i \mid i \in I\}$ is a sub-formula of Ψ.
- R_Ψ.

The set of types Γ_Ψ consists of types of the form $\Sigma_\Phi = \{R_{\varphi_i}(\bar{x}) \mid i \in I\} \cup \left\{\neg R_{\bigwedge\{\varphi_i \mid i \in I\}}(\bar{x})\right\}$ whenever $\Phi = \bigwedge \{\varphi_i(\bar{x}) \mid i \in I\}$ is a sub-formula of Ψ (and $\bar{x}$ a tuple of variables).

Finally, given an L-structure M, the induced L_Ψ-structure $M_* = H_\Psi(M)$ has the same universe, and for every $R_\varphi \in L_\Psi$, $R_\varphi^{M_*} = \varphi^M$. Note that M_* omits all the types in Γ_Ψ, and since Ψ is consistent, T_Ψ is consistent. Also, if $M_1 \cong M_2$ then $H_\Psi(M_1) \cong H_\Psi(M_2)$.

Conversely, given a model N of T_Ψ which omits all types in Γ_Ψ, define an L-structure N_*, which in fact will be $H_\Psi^{-1}(N)$, by $P^{N_*} = \left(R_{P(x_0,\ldots,x_{n-1})}\right)^N$ for every n-place predicate $P \in L$, and similarly for every n-place function symbol $F \in L$. Note that this map also respects isomorphisms. □

Remark 2.10. The map $\Psi \mapsto (L_\Psi, T_\Psi, \Gamma_\Psi, H_\Psi)$ is absolute in the sense that if $\Psi \in \mathbb{V}$ and $\mathbb{U}$ is a transitive model of ZFC extending $\mathbb{V}$, then $(L_\Psi, T_\Psi, \Gamma_\Psi)$ are the same in $\mathbb{U}$ as in $\mathbb{V}$ and H_Ψ defines the same function when restricted to $\mathbb{V}$. This is easily seen by induction on the rank of Ψ.

Recall:

Definition 2.11. Let T be a consistent first order theory (not necessarily complete), and let $\Sigma(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ be a partial type. We say that a formula $\varphi(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ *isolates* Σ in T if $T \cup \{\exists \bar{x} \varphi(\bar{x})\}$ is consistent and $T \vdash \varphi \to \psi$ for every $\psi \in \Sigma$. The partial type Σ is *isolated* in T if some formula isolates it in T.

Definition 2.12. A structure M for a language L is called *atomic* if for every finite tuple $\bar{a} \in M^{<\omega}$, $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{a}/\emptyset)$ is isolated in $Th(M)$. Similarly, we say that a set $A \subseteq M$ is *atomic* if for every finite tuple $\bar{a} \in A^{<\omega}$, $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{a}/\emptyset)$ is isolated in $Th(M)$. We add "over B" for some set $B \subseteq M$ to mean that we replace $\emptyset$ with B.

Proposition 2.13. *Suppose that M is a countable structure, and that $\Psi = Sc(M)$ is its Scott sentence (see Proposition 2.5). Then the induced theory T_Ψ is countable and has a natural completion, $T_\Psi^{co} = Th(H_\Psi(M))$. Furthermore, the induced L_Ψ-structure $H_\Psi(M)$ is atomic.*

Proof. The theory T_Ψ is countable since Ψ is in $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$. This also implies that Γ_Ψ is countable.

In order to show that $H_\Psi(M)$ is atomic, take any tuple $\bar{a} \in M^{<\omega}$. We will show that $R_{\phi_{\beta,\bar{a}}}$ isolates $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{a}/\emptyset)$ (recall the construction of $\Psi = Sc(M)$ in Proposition 2.5). Suppose that $\theta(\bar{x}) \in \mathrm{tp}(\bar{a}/\emptyset)$, and $H_\Psi(M) \models \exists \bar{x}\left(R_{\phi_{\beta,\bar{a}}} \wedge \neg\theta(\bar{x})\right)$. Suppose that $\bar{b} \models R_{\phi_{\beta,\bar{a}}}(\bar{x}) \wedge \neg\theta(\bar{x})$ where $\bar{b}$ is from M. But then $M \models \phi_{\beta,\bar{a}}\left(\bar{b}\right)$, so there is an automorphism σ of M which takes $\bar{b}$ to $\bar{a}$ (see the proof of Proposition 2.5). But then σ is also an automorphism of $H_\Psi(M)$ — a contradiction. □

Remark 2.14. In the same context of Proposition 2.13, the completion T_Ψ^{co} can also be constructed directly from T_Ψ without passing through M. Namely, for an ordinal α define a consistent L_Ψ-theory T_Ψ^α by induction on α by: $T_\Psi^0 = T_\Psi$; for α limit, take $T_\Psi^\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} T_\Psi^\beta$; finally, for $\alpha = \beta + 1$, define

$$T_\Psi^\alpha = T_\Psi^\beta \cup \left\{ \neg\exists\bar{x}\left(\varphi(\bar{x})\right) \,\middle|\, \varphi(\bar{x}) \text{ isolates } \Sigma_\Phi \text{ in } T_\Psi^\beta \text{ for some sub-formula } \Phi \text{ of } \Psi \right\}.$$

(Recall Σ_Φ from the construction of $T_\Psi$in Lemma 2.9 above.)

Since L_Ψ is countable we must get stuck at some countable ordinal α, and we let $T_\Psi^{co} = T_\Psi^\alpha$. Since $H_\Psi(M)$ omits all the types in Γ_Ψ, $H_\Psi(M) \models T_\Psi^\beta$ for all β, and in particular $H_\Psi(M) \models T_\Psi^\alpha$. The types in Γ_Ψ are not isolated in T_Ψ^α (if $\varphi(\bar{x})$ isolates some Σ_Φ in T_Ψ^α, then $T_\Psi^{\alpha+1} = T_\Psi^\alpha$ includes $\neg\exists\bar{x}(\varphi(\bar{x}))$). Moreover, this is true for any consistent extension $T_\Psi^\alpha \cup \{\theta\}$ for a sentence θ (if $\varphi(\bar{x})$ isolates some type in $T_\Psi^\alpha \cup \{\theta\}$, then $\varphi(\bar{x}) \wedge \theta$ isolates it in T_Ψ^α). By the omitting type theorem for countable languages (see [Mar02, Theorem 4.2.4]), $T_\Psi^\alpha \cup \{\theta\}$ has a countable model N which omits all the types in Γ_Ψ, and so by Lemma 2.9, $H_\Psi^{-1}(N) \models \Psi$, and so $H_\Psi^{-1}(N) \cong M$ and hence $N \cong H_\Psi(M)$. We conclude that for any such θ, $T_\Psi^\alpha \vdash \theta$. Hence T_Ψ^α is complete. This construction of T_Ψ^{co} is absolute from Ψ.

3. Translating the question

Here we will translate $(\star')$ from Section 1 to a question about the existence of atomic models.

Suppose that $(P, L, \dot{\tau})$ has the isomorphism property. By Proposition 2.6, there is an $L_{\infty,\omega}$ sentence $\Psi_{\dot{\tau}}$ in $\mathbb{V}$ which P forces to be τ's Scott sentence. It makes sense then to let $L_{\Psi_{\dot{\tau}}}$, $T_{\Psi_{\dot{\tau}}}$,

$T^{co}_{\Psi_{\dot\tau}}$ and $\Gamma_{\Psi_{\dot\tau}}$ be the induced language, theories and collection of types as in Lemma 2.9. By Remarks 2.10 and 2.14, they are the same in $\mathbb{V}$ as in $\mathbb{V}[G]$ for any generic filter G.

Recall the following definition.

Definition 3.1. Suppose T is a first order theory. We say that the *isolated types are dense in* T if whenever $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is a consistent formula, i.e., $T \cup \{\exists \bar{x} \varphi\}$ is consistent (where $\bar{x}$ is a finite tuple of variables), there is a consistent formula $\theta(\bar{x})$ such that $T \vdash \theta \to \varphi$ and θ isolates a complete type: for every formula $\psi(\bar{x})$, either $T \models \theta \to \psi$ or $T \models \theta \to \neg\psi$.

Fact 3.2. [Mar02, Thoerem 4.2.10] *Suppose that T is a countable complete theory, then the following are equivalent:*

- *T has a countable atomic model.*
- *The isolated types are dense in T.*

Fact 3.3. [Mar02, Theorem 4.2.8, Corollary 4.2.16] *Suppose that M and N are countable atomic models of a countable complete theory T. Then $M \cong N$.*

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose that P is a forcing notion, L a language which P forces to be countable, and $\dot\tau$ a P-name for an L-structure with universe ω such that $(P, L, \dot\tau)$ has the isomorphism property. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *For some $M \in \mathbb{V}$, $P \Vdash \dot\tau \cong \check{M}$.*
(2) *$T^{co}_{\Psi_{\dot\tau}}$ has an atomic model.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): By (1), for some $M \in \mathbb{V}$, $P \Vdash \dot\tau \cong \check{M}$. Then $M \models \Psi_{\dot\tau}$, and $H_{\Psi_{\dot\tau}}(M) \models T^{co}_{\Psi_{\dot\tau}}$. Let G be a generic filter for P. Then by Proposition 2.13, in $\mathbb{V}[G]$, $H_{\Psi_{\dot\tau}}(M)$ is an atomic model of $T^{co}_{\Psi_{\dot\tau}}$, but being an atomic model is absolute, hence the same is true in $\mathbb{V}$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Let G be any generic filter. Then by Proposition 2.13, in $\mathbb{V}[G]$, $T^{co}_{\Psi_{\dot\tau}}$ is countable and $H_{\Psi_{\dot\tau}}(\dot\tau[G])$ is an atomic model of $T^{co}_{\Psi_{\dot\tau}}$. By (2), $T^{co}_{\Psi_{\dot\tau}}$ has an atomic model N which we can assume has cardinality $\leq |L_{\Psi_{\dot\tau}}| = \aleph_0^{\mathbb{V}[G]}$ by taking an elementary substructure. Let $M = H^{-1}_{\Psi_{\dot\tau}}(N)$. In $\mathbb{V}[G]$, N is countable, so isomorphic to $H_{\Psi_{\dot\tau}}(\dot\tau[G])$ in $\mathbb{V}[G]$ by Fact 3.3, hence $M \cong \dot\tau[G]$. $\square$

Recall that a forcing notion P is good when the answer to $(\star')$ is "yes" for every L and $\dot\tau$: whenever $(P, L, \dot\tau)$ has the isomorphism property, for some L-structure $M \in \mathbb{V}$, $P \Vdash \dot\tau \cong \check{M}$.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose that P is a forcing notion. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *P is good.*
(2) *For every complete first order theory T such that the isolated types are dense in T and $P \Vdash \left|\check{T}\right| = \aleph_0$, T has an atomic model.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Suppose T is a complete first order theory in a language L in which the isolated types are dense, and $P \Vdash |T| = \aleph_0$. Let $\dot{\tau}$ be a name for a countable atomic model of T (exists by Fact 3.2). Then by Fact 3.3, $(P, L, \dot{\tau})$ has the isomorphism property. By (1), for some $M \in \mathbb{V}$, $P \Vdash \dot{\tau} \cong \check{M}$. Let G be a generic filter for P. Then in $\mathbb{V}[G]$, M is an atomic model of T, but being an atomic model of T is absolute, hence the same is true in $\mathbb{V}$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Suppose that $(P, L, \dot{\tau})$ has the isomorphism property. By Theorem 3.4, it is enough to show that $T^{co}_{\Psi_{\dot{\tau}}}$ has an atomic model, so by (2) it is enough to show that the isolated types are dense. Let G be a generic filter. Then by Proposition 2.13, in $\mathbb{V}[G]$, $T^{co}_{\Psi_{\dot{\tau}}}$ is complete and countable and $H_{\Psi_{\dot{\tau}}}(\dot{\tau}[G])$ is an atomic model of $T^{co}_{\Psi_{\dot{\tau}}}$. Hence by fact 3.2, the isolated types are dense in $T^{co}_{\Psi_{\dot{\tau}}}$. But this is an absolute property, hence the same is true in $\mathbb{V}$. □

4. On the existence of atomic models

In Section 4.1, we give a general criterion for when P is good. In Sections 4.2 and 4.3 we investigate when an atomic model exist under classification theoretic assumption.

4.1. A criterion: collapsing $\aleph_2$ to $\aleph_0$.

Having translated $(\star')$ to a question on the existence of atomic models in Theorem 3.5, we can now start to provide some answers. In Corollary 4.3, we provide a positive answer (i.e., P is good), provided that P does not collapse $\aleph_2$ to $\aleph_0$. Conversely, in Corollary 4.5 we prove that if P does collapse $\aleph_2$ to $\aleph_0$ then P is not good.

First we note that by Fact 3.2 the following is immediate.

Corollary 4.1. *If P is a forcing notion that does not collapse $\aleph_1$ then P is good.*

For completeness we provide a proof of the following proposition, which is really an adaptation of [She90, Chapter IV, Theorem 5.5]. This theorem was also proved independently by Julia Knight [Kni78, Theorem 1.3] and David Kueker [Kue78, Page 168].

Proposition 4.2. *Suppose $|T| = \aleph_1$ and the isolated types are dense in T. Then T has an atomic model.*

Proof. Let $M \models T$ be $\aleph_1$-saturated. Construct an atomic set $N = \{b_i \mid i < \omega_1\} \subseteq M$ such that for any formula $\varphi(x, \bar{b})$, with $\bar{b}$ a finite tuple from N, if $M \models \exists x \varphi(x, \bar{b})$ then for some $c \in N$, $M \models \varphi(c, \bar{b})$. Then N is an atomic model of T. By an easy book-keeping argument, it is enough to show that if $A \subseteq M$ is a countable atomic set, $\bar{b}$ is a finite tuple from A, and $M \models \exists x \varphi(x, \bar{b})$, then for some $c \in M$, $M \models \varphi(c, \bar{b})$ and $A \cup \{c\}$ is atomic.

For a consistent formula $\psi(\bar{x})$, choose a consistent formula $\theta_\psi(\bar{x})$ which isolates a complete type and implies ψ.

Enumerate $A = \{a_i \mid i < \omega\}$, and assume that $\bar{b} = (a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1})$. For $i < \omega$, let $\bar{a}_i = (a_0, \ldots, a_{i-1})$, and let $\theta_i(\bar{z}_i)$ isolate $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{a}_i)$. Construct a sequence of formulas $\psi_i(x, \bar{z}_i)$ such

that: for $i \geq n$: $\psi_n(x, \bar{z}_n) \to \varphi(x, \bar{z}_n)$; ψ_i is consistent; $T \models \psi_{i+1} \to \psi_i$; ψ_i isolates a complete type and $\bar{a}_i \models \exists x \psi_i(x, \bar{z}_i)$. The construction: $\psi_n = \theta_{\varphi(x,\bar{z}_n) \wedge \theta_n(\bar{z}_n)}$ and $\psi_{i+1} = \theta_{\psi_{i(x,\bar{z}_i)} \wedge \theta_{i+1}(\bar{z}_{i+1})}$. Finally, $\{\psi_i(x, \bar{a}_i) \mid n \leq i < \omega\}$ is consistent, so let $c \in M$ satisfy this type. □

Corollary 4.3. *If P is a forcing notion that does not collapse $\aleph_2$ to $\aleph_0$ then P is good.*

Fact 4.4. [LS93] *There is a complete first order theory T with a sort V whose elements form an indiscernible set in any model M of T, such that for any set $A \subseteq V^M$, the isolated types in $T(A)$ are dense but if $|A| \geq \aleph_2$, $T(A)$ has no atomic model.*

Corollary 4.5. *If P collapses $\aleph_2$ to $\aleph_0$ then P is not good.*

In conclusion, P is good iff P does not collapse $\aleph_2$ to $\aleph_0$.

4.2. **Totally transcendental theories.**

Definition 4.6. Recall that a complete first order theory T is called *totally transcendental* if there is no sequence of formulas $\langle \varphi_s(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_s) \mid s \in 2^{<\omega} \rangle$ such that in some model M of T there are tuples $\langle \bar{a}_s \mid s \in 2^{<\omega} \rangle$ such that for each $\eta \in 2^\omega$ the type $\left\{ \varphi_{\eta \restriction n}(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{\eta \restriction n})^{\eta(n)} \;\middle|\; n < \omega \right\}$ is consistent (where $\varphi^0 = \neg\varphi$, $\varphi^1 = \varphi$).

Fact 4.7. [TZ12, Lemma 5.3.4, Corollary 5.3.7] *If T is totally transcendental, then T has an atomic model.*

Note that for a complete first order theory T, being totally transcendental is an absolute property. This follows from the fact that having an infinite branch in a tree is an absolute property. Namely, define the tree Σ consisting of finite families of sequences of formulas of the form $\langle \varphi_s(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_s) \mid s \in 2^{<n} \rangle$ such that it is consistent with T that there are tuples $\langle \bar{a}_s \mid s \in 2^{<n} \rangle$ with the property that for each $t \in 2^n$ the type $\left\{ \varphi_{t \restriction k}(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_{t \restriction k})^{t(k)} \;\middle|\; k < n \right\}$ is consistent. The order between two such finite families is

$$\left\langle \varphi_s(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_s) \;\middle|\; s \in 2^{<n} \right\rangle \leq \left\langle \psi_s(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_s) \;\middle|\; s \in 2^{<m} \right\rangle$$

iff $n \leq m$ and for each $s \in 2^{<n}$, $\varphi_s = \psi_s$. This is easily seen to be a set theoretic tree. Then T is totally transcendental iff Σ has no infinite branch. This is a Δ_1 property, and hence absolute, see [Jec03, Lemma 13.11].

Definition 4.8. Recall that a complete first order theory T in a countable language is called *ω-stable* if for every countable model $M \models T$, the number of complete 1-types over M is at most $\aleph_0$.

It is easy to see that if T is ω-stable then it is also totally transcendental. The converse is also true when T is countable. See [TZ12, Theorem 5.2.6].

Corollary 4.9. *Suppose that $(P, L, \dot{\tau})$ has the isomorphism property, and that $\Psi = \Psi_{\dot{\tau}} \in L_{\infty,\omega}$ is the Scott sentence of $\dot{\tau}$. Let T^{co}_{Ψ} be the induced theory. Then if $P \Vdash$ "T^{co}_{Ψ} is ω-stable", then for some $M \in \mathbb{V}$, $P \Vdash \dot{\tau} \cong \check{M}$.*

Proof. Since P forces that T^{co}_{Ψ} is ω-stable and countable, it follows that $P \Vdash$"T^{co}_{Ψ} is totally transcendental". But then T^{co}_{Ψ} is totally transcendental by absoluteness. So T^{co}_{Ψ} has an atomic model by Fact 4.7, and hence by Theorem 3.4 we are done. □

Warning: it is tempting to think that if $(P, L, \dot{\tau})$ has the isomorphism property and $P \Vdash$"$Th(\dot{\tau})$ is ω-stable" then $T^{co}_{\Psi_{\dot{\tau}}}$ is ω-stable. However this is not the case.

Example 4.10. It is well known that there is a graph on ω with language $\{S\}$ (so S is a 2-place relation) such that the full theory $(\mathbb{N}, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ can be interpreted in (ω, S) see e.g., [Hod93, Theorem 5.5.1]. Let $L = \{P, Q, \pi_1, \pi_2\} \cup \{Q_k \mid k < \omega\}$ where P, Q are unary predicates, π_1, π_2 are unary function symbols, and for $k < \omega$, Q_k is a unary predicate. Let M be the following L-structure: its universe is the union of $P^M \cup Q^M$ where $P^M = \omega$ and

$$Q^M = \{(n, m, \alpha) \mid n, m < \omega, \alpha \leq \omega, (n\ S\ m \to \alpha < \omega)\}.$$

The function $\pi_1^M : Q^M \to P^M$ is the projection to the first coordinate ($\pi_1^M(n, m, \alpha) = n$) and $\pi_2^M : Q^M \to P^M$ is the projection to the second coordinate (meaning that on P^M, π_1 and π_2 are the identity). Finally, $Q_k^M = \{(n, m, k) \mid n, m < \omega\}$. Let $T = Th(M)$. Then it is easy to see that T has quantifier elimination. If $N \equiv M$ is a countable model, then the number of 1-types over N is countable: given $c \notin N$ in some elementary extension, the type of c over N is determined as follows. If $c \in P$ its type is the unique (non-algebraic) type. Otherwise the type of c is determined by the unique $k < \omega$ so that $c \in Q_k$ (if there is any) and by the type of the pair $(\pi_1(c), \pi_2(c))$ over N. Hence T is ω-stable.

Let $\Psi = \Psi_M$ be the Scott sentence of M. For any $a \in Q^M \setminus \bigcup_{k<\omega} Q_k^M$, $\bigwedge_{k<\omega} \neg Q_k(x)$ holds. Even though formally $\varphi(x) = \bigwedge_{k<\omega} \neg Q_k(x)$ is not a sub-formula of Ψ (because $\phi_{0,a}$ contains the full atomic type of a), φ^M is a definable set in $H_\Psi(M)$. It follows that in $H_\Psi(M)$, ω is definable (by R_P) and also S: $n\ S\ m$ iff $R_P(n)$, $R_P(m)$ and $\forall z \in R_Q\left((\pi_1(z) = n \wedge \pi_2(z) = m) \to \neg\left(\varphi^M(z)\right)\right)$. So a model of T_Ψ can interpret the full theory of arithmetic. In particular, T_Ψ is not ω-stable.

4.3. **Superstable theories.** Recall the following definition.

Definition 4.11. A complete first order theory T is superstable if there exists some cardinal λ such that for all model $M \models T$, $|S_1(M)| \leq |M| + \lambda$.

We start by giving an example, similar in spirit to the one in Fact 4.4, but here we replace $\aleph_2$ with $\left(2^{\aleph_0}\right)^+$, and the theory involved is superstable.

Example 4.12. (Thanks to Chris Laskowski) Let $N \in \omega$. Let $L_N = \{U, V, \pi\} \cup \{E_n \mid n < N+1\}$ where U, V are unary predicates, π is a unary function symbol and for $n < N+1$, E_n is a binary relation. Let $T_N^\forall$ be the following theory:

- U, V are disjoint.
- $\pi : U \to V$.
- For each $n < N$: E_n is an equivalence relation on U; $E_{n+1} \subseteq E_n$; E_{n+1} has at most two classes in any E_n class; E_0 has just one class.

Now, $T_N^\forall$ is a universal theory with the amalgamation and disjoint embedding properties. Hence by e.g., [Hod93, Theorem 7.4.1], it has a model completion, T_N, which eliminates quantifiers and is ω-categorical. One can also check that $T_{N+1} \supseteq T_N$. Let $T = \bigcup_{N<\omega} T_N$.

Claim 4.13. T is superstable but not ω-stable.

Proof of claim. If M is a countable model of T, then for each $n < \omega$, M contains representatives for all the 2^n classes of E_n. Hence there are 2^ω many types over M, so T is not ω-stable. However, it is superstable by quantifier elimination, as there are at most $2^{\aleph_0} + \lambda$ 1-types over a model of size λ. □

Claim 4.14. The isolated types are dense in T.

Proof of claim. Suppose that $\psi(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ is a consistent formula in T. Suppose ψ is in L_{N+1} for some N. Let $\bar{a} = a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ realize ψ in some model $M \models T$ and assume that $\bar{a} \subseteq U^M$. There are 2^N many E_N-classes, and let us partition $\bar{a}$ into these classes, and suppose the largest such class has l elements. Let $K \geq N$ be such that $2^{K-N} \geq l$, so each E_N classes contains at least l distinct E_K-classes. Let $\bar{b} = b_0, \ldots, b_{n-1}$ in M have the same type as $\bar{a}$ in L_{N+1} but b_i and b_j are not E_K-equivalent for $i \neq j$ (such a $\bar{b}$ exists since $M \upharpoonright L_{K+1}$ is an existentially closed model of $T_{K+1}^\forall$, and by our choice of K). Let $p(\bar{x})$ be the quantifier free type of $\bar{b}$ in L_{K+1}, so it is a finite set, and let $\theta(\bar{x}) = \bigwedge p$. Then $T \models \theta \to \psi$ and θ isolates a complete type (since if $\bar{c} \models \theta$, then the partition of $\bar{c}$ by any equivalence relation E_i is determined by θ). If $\bar{a}$ contains also some elements from V, then a simple adjustment of the above argument will work. □

Hence T has an atomic model M_0 by Fact 3.2. Note that, by quantifier elimination, in any model $N \models T$, V^N is an infinite indiscernible set: all sets of elements of size n have the same type. Let $N \models T$ be of size $\geq \left(2^{\aleph_0}\right)^+$ and assume that N contains some $A \subseteq V^N$ of size $\geq \left(2^{\aleph_0}\right)^+$. Let $T(A)$ be the expansion of T by the full theory of N in the language $L(A)$ (where we add constants for elements of A).

Claim 4.15. $T(A)$ is superstable of size $|A|$. The isolated types are dense in $T(A)$ but $T(A)$ has no atomic model.

Proof of claim. The first sentence is clear. To see that the isolated types are dense in $T(A)$, one can either repeat the proof of Claim 4.14, or note that since A is an indiscernible set, given a consistent formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$ ($\bar{a}$ is a tuple from A), there is some tuple $\bar{b}$ in V^{M_0} with the same type as $\bar{a}$. Suppose that $\psi(\bar{y})$ isolates the type of $\bar{b}$. There is a formula $\theta(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ which isolates a type and implies $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \wedge \psi(\bar{y})$, so $\theta(\bar{x}, \bar{b})$ is consistent, implies $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b})$ and isolates a complete type and hence so is $\theta(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$.

Suppose $N \models T(A)$ is atomic. Since π is onto (which follows from our choice of T), $\left|U^N\right| > 2^{\aleph_0}$. Hence there are $a, b \in U^N$ such that $a \; E_n \; b$ for all $n < \omega$. But easily, the type $\mathrm{tp}(a, b)$ is not isolated by quantifier elimination. □

This example gives a weaker version of Corollary 4.5.

Corollary 4.16. *Example 4.12 shows that if P collapses $\left(2^{\aleph_0}\right)^+$ to $\aleph_0$ then P is not good, and (2) in Theorem 3.5 can be witnessed with a superstable theory.*

Now, we will show that under Martin's Axiom, if T is superstable, then such an example as in 4.4 cannot exist.

Notation 4.17. Let $(P, <)$ be a partial order. We use the standard interpretation of "strength" in P when we think of it as a forcing notion, i.e., a is stronger than b if $a < b$.

Definition 4.18 (**Martin's Axiom**)**.** For an infinite cardinal κ, let MA_κ (Martin's Axiom for κ) be the following statement:

- If $(P, <)$ is partially ordered set that satisfies the countable chain condition and if D is a collection of at most κ dense subsets of P, then there exists a D-generic set G on P (i.e., G meets every element of D, G is downward directed: if $p, q \in G$ then there is a condition stronger than both p, q, and if r is weaker than p, then r is in G).

Remark 4.19. We will in fact need a weakening of Martin's Axiom, namely, $MA(\text{Cohen})_\kappa$, which states that whenever D is a collection of at most κ dense subsets of the Cohen forcing (adding one real), then there is a D-generic set G on P. It is well known that any non-trivial countable forcing notion is forcing-equivalent to Cohen forcing (i.e., they generate the same generic extension). Hence $MA(\text{Cohen})_\kappa$ is equivalent to $MA(\text{countable})_\kappa$ (the restriction of MA_κ to countable forcing notions). Note that $MA(\text{Cohen})_\kappa$ implies that $\kappa < 2^{\aleph_0}$.

To prove the next theorem we will also have to recall:

Definition 4.20. [She90, II, Definition 1.1] Let T be a complete first order theory with monster model $\mathfrak{C}$. Let $p(\bar{x})$ be a partial type. We define by induction on α when is $R_\infty(p) \geq \alpha$ as follows:

- $R_\infty(p) \geq 0$ iff p is consistent.

- When δ is a limit ordinal, then $R_\infty(p) \geq \delta$ iff $R_\infty(p) \geq \alpha$ for all $\alpha < \delta$.
- $R_\infty(p) \geq \alpha + 1$ iff for every finite $q \subseteq p$, and for every cardinal μ, there are partial types $\{q_i(\bar{x}) \mid i < \mu\}$ such that $R_\infty(q_i \cup q) \geq \alpha$, and $q_i \cup q_j$ are explicitly inconsistent for $i \neq j$ (i.e., there is a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ such that for some $\bar{a} \in \mathfrak{C}$, $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in q_i$, $\neg\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in q_j$).

We will need some facts about forking in order to continue. Let T be a complete first order theory, and suppose that $\mathfrak{C}$ is its monster model. Given a set $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ (whose size is, as usual, smaller than $|\mathfrak{C}|$) there is a class of formulas with parameters in $\mathfrak{C}$ which are called the *forking formulas* over A. The precise definition can be found in e.g., [TZ12, Definition 7.1.7]. Given a tuple $\bar{a}$ and sets $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$, we write $\bar{a} \mathop{\smile\!\!\!\!\!\!|}_A B$ when $p = \mathrm{tp}(\bar{a}/B)$ does not fork over A, meaning that no formula in p forks over A. For our purposes we will need the following facts:

Fact 4.21. [TZ12, Section 8.5] *Let $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$. For any formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$, it forks over A iff it forks over* $\mathrm{acl}(A)$ *iff any equivalent formula forks over A, so forking is a property of definable sets and not of formulas. The set of formulas $\varphi(\bar{x})$ over B which fork over A form an ideal (a finite disjunction of forking formulas forks over A, if ψ forks over A and $\varphi \vdash \psi$ then φ forks over A, and $\bar{x} \neq \bar{x}$ forks over A). As a result, if $q(\bar{x})$ is a partial type over B which does not fork over A, then there is a complete type $q \subseteq p$ over B which does not fork over A (this is a non-forking extension of q).*

If T is stable, then any type over A does not fork over A. If moreover $A = \mathrm{acl}^{\mathrm{eq}}(A)$ (here we assume $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}^{\mathrm{eq}}$), then any complete type over A has a unique non-forking extension to B.

The connection between forking and ranks is given in:

Fact 4.22. [She90, III, Lemma 1.2] *Suppose that $p(\bar{x})$ is a partial type over A, $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$ a formula and $R_\infty(p) = R_\infty(p \cup \{\varphi\}) < \infty$. Then φ does not fork over A.*

Fact 4.23. [She90, II, Theorem 3.14] *A complete theory T is superstable iff for any formula $\varphi(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ (perhaps with parameters), $R_\infty(\varphi) < \infty$. Superstable theories are stable.*

Before stating the main theorem, let us recall another fact:

Lemma 4.24. *If M is a structure, and $A \subseteq M$ is an atomic set, then so is* $\mathrm{acl}(A)$.

Proof. The proof is an easy exercise in the definitions. □

Theorem 4.25. *Assume $MA(Cohen)_\kappa$. Suppose T is superstable and countable, and $A \subseteq M \models T$ has size $\leq \kappa^+$. If the isolated types are dense in $T(A)$, then $T(A)$ has an atomic model.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{C} \models T$ be a monster model of T containing A (so $\mathfrak{C}$ is a reduct of the monster model of $T(A)$ to the language L of T). We may assume that $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}^{\mathrm{eq}}$. As in the proof of Proposition

4.2, it is enough to show that if $B \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ is an atomic set over A of size $\leq \kappa$, $\bar{b}$ is a finite tuple from B, $\bar{a}$ a finite tuple from A, and $\mathfrak{C} \models \exists x \varphi\left(x, \bar{b}, \bar{a}\right)$, then for some $c \in \mathfrak{C}$, $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi\left(c, \bar{b}, \bar{a}\right)$ and $B \cup \{c\}$ is atomic over A.

Since T is superstable, there is some consistent formula $\psi\left(x, \bar{c}\right)$ over $D = \mathrm{acl}^{\mathrm{eq}}\left(A \cup B\right)$ such that $\psi \vdash \varphi$, and $\alpha = R_{\infty}\left(\psi\right)$ is minimal among all consistent formulas over D which imply φ. Let $C = \mathrm{acl}^{\mathrm{eq}}\left(\bar{c}\right) \subseteq D$, so C is a countable set (the algebraic closure is taken in T and not in $T\left(A\right)$). Let $\pi\left(x\right)$ be the partial type over D consisting of all formulas of the form $\neg\chi\left(x, \bar{e}\right)$ where $\bar{e}$ is from D and χ forks over C (equivalently, χ forks over $\bar{c}$).

We will say that two formulas $\xi\left(x\right), \zeta\left(x\right)$ (with parameters from $\mathfrak{C}$) are *equivalent modulo* π if $\pi \vdash \zeta \leftrightarrow \xi$.

Claim 4.26. If $\xi\left(x, \bar{d}\right)$ is a consistent formula over D such that $\xi \vdash \psi$ then ξ is equivalent modulo π to a consistent formula over C.

Proof of claim. By choice of ψ, $R_{\infty}\left(\xi\right) = R_{\infty}\left(\psi\right)$. By Fact 4.22, $\xi\left(x\right)$ does not fork over C. Suppose $\mathfrak{C} \models \xi\left(e\right)$ for some $e \models \pi$. Let $p = \mathrm{tp}\left(e/C\right)$. Then $q = \mathrm{tp}\left(e/D\right)$ is a non-forking extension of p, but by Fact 4.21, q is the unique non-forking extension of p, so $\pi \cup p \vdash \xi$, and by compactness, for some $\zeta_e \in p$, $\pi \cup \{\zeta_e\} \vdash \xi$. Hence by compactness, ξ is equivalent modulo π to a finite disjunction of such formulas $\zeta_i\left(x\right)$ over C. □

Let P be the set of consistent formulas $\xi\left(x\right)$ over C which imply ψ. We define an order $<$ on P by: $\xi < \zeta$ iff $\mathfrak{C} \models \xi \to \zeta$. Equivalently, $\pi \vdash \xi \to \zeta$ (as ξ and ζ are formulas over C, so if $a \models \xi$, and $\pi \vdash \xi \to \zeta$, then $p = \mathrm{tp}\left(a/C\right)$ does not fork over C, so we can find some $a' \models p$ such that $a' \models \pi$, so $a' \models \zeta$, and hence $\zeta \in p$, so $a \models \zeta$). Note that P is countable.

Fix some finite tuple $\bar{d}$ from B. Let $X_{\bar{d}}$ be the set of formulas ξ from P such that: $\pi \vdash \xi\left(x\right) \to \beta\left(x, \bar{d}', \bar{a}\right)$ for some formula β, where $\bar{a}$ is a finite tuple from A and $\bar{d}'$ is a finite tuple from D containing $\bar{d}$, such that $\beta\left(x, \bar{y}, \bar{a}\right)$ isolates a complete type over A.

We claim that $X_{\bar{d}}$ is dense in P. Indeed, let $\zeta\left(x, \bar{e}\right) \in P$ (so $\bar{e}$ is a finite tuple from C). Since $\bar{e}$ is algebraic over $\bar{c}$, by Lemma 4.24, $\mathrm{tp}\left(\bar{e}\bar{d}/A\right)$ is isolated, say by $\theta_{\bar{e}\bar{d}}\left(\bar{y}, \bar{z}, \bar{a}'\right)$. Let $\beta'\left(x, \bar{y}, \bar{z}, \bar{a}'\right) = \zeta\left(x, \bar{y}\right) \wedge \theta_{\bar{e}\bar{d}}\left(\bar{y}, \bar{z}, \bar{a}'\right)$. This is a consistent formula, so by assumption, there is some consistent $\beta\left(x, \bar{y}, \bar{z}, \bar{a}\right) \vdash \beta'\left(x, \bar{y}, \bar{z}, \bar{a}'\right)$ which isolates a complete type over A, where $\bar{a}$ is a finite tuple from A. Note that $\beta\left(x, \bar{e}, \bar{d}, \bar{a}\right)$ is consistent and implies $\zeta\left(x, \bar{e}\right)$. By Claim 4.26, $\beta\left(x, \bar{e}, \bar{d}, \bar{a}\right)$ is equivalent modulo π to some formula $\xi\left(x, \bar{e}'\right)$ over C from P. Then $\pi \vdash \xi \to \zeta$ and $\xi \in X_{\bar{d}}$ so we are done.

By $MA\left(\mathrm{Cohen}\right)_{\kappa}$, there is some $\left\{X_{\bar{d}} \middle| \bar{d} \in B^{<\omega}\right\}$ -generic set $G \subseteq P$. Note that G is a type (i.e., consistent). This is because all the elements of P are consistent and since G is downward directed.

Being a partial type over C, G does not fork over C, so $G \cup \pi$ is consistent. Let $c \models G \cup \pi$.

First of all, $c \models G$ and any formula in G implies $\psi(x, \bar{c})$, which implies $\varphi(x, \bar{b}, \bar{a})$, so $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi(c, \bar{b}, \bar{a})$. Now, suppose that $\bar{d} \frown \langle c \rangle$ is some finite tuple from $B \cup \{c\}$. By choice of G, there is some $\xi \in G \cap X_{\bar{d}}$, so for some $\beta(x, \bar{d}', \bar{a})$ as above, $\beta(c, \bar{d}', \bar{a})$ holds (since $c \models \pi$), $\bar{d}' = \bar{d} \frown \bar{d}''$ for some $\bar{d}''$, and $\beta(x, \bar{y}, \bar{y}'', \bar{a})$ isolates a complete type over A. Then $\exists \bar{y}'' \beta(x, \bar{y}, \bar{y}'', \bar{a}) \in \mathrm{tp}(c\bar{d}/A)$ isolates a complete type, so $B \cup \{c\}$ is atomic. □

Remark 4.27. In the stable case, our methods allow us to construct only a locally atomic model (without Martin's Axiom, but still assuming that the underlying language is countable). This is a classical result by Lachlan, see [Lac72], later improved upon by Newelski [New90], where he replaces the assumption that the theory is countable by a weaker one.

By Fact 4.7, the remark after Definition 4.8, Example 4.12 and Theorem 4.25 we conclude:

Corollary 4.28. *Suppose T is a countable first order theory, $A \subseteq M \models T$ and κ is a cardinal such that the isolated types in $T(A)$ are dense and $|A| \leq \kappa^+$. Then:*

1. *If T is ω-stable then $T(A)$ has an atomic model.*
2. *If T is superstable and $MA(Cohen)_\kappa$ holds then $T(A)$ has an atomic model.*
3. *If T is superstable but $MA(Cohen)_\kappa$ does not hold then $T(A)$ may not have an atomic model.*

Problem 4.29. Does Theorem 4.25 hold when T is stable?

5. On linear orders

In this section we will try to focus on the particular case when the structures involved are linear orders. Assume that $L = \{<\}$ (where $<$ is a binary relation symbol). Let P be a forcing notion, and $\dot{\tau}$ a P-name for an infinite linear order with universe ω. Again we ask: suppose that $(P, L, \dot{\tau})$ has the isomorphism property (see Definition 1.1). Does it follow that for some linear order $I = (X, <) \in \mathbb{V}$, $P \Vdash \check{I} \cong \dot{\tau}$?

In private communications with Zapletal, we were told that he solved the problem positively for set theoretic trees (i.e., structures of the form $(X, <)$ where $<$ is a partial order and the set below every element is well-ordered).

In Section 5.1 we translate the problem to that of finding an atomic model in certain classes of theories, contained in a bigger class $\mathbf{K}_\mu$. In Section 5.2 we will further analyze these classes and give an equivalent definition. In Section 5.3, we give an example of a theory in $\mathbf{K}_\mu$ for $\mu = \left(2^{\aleph_0}\right)^+$, with no atomic model.

5.1. **The class $\mathbf{K}_\mu$.** Let $coll(\mu, \aleph_0)$ be the Levy collapse of μ to $\aleph_0$. Note that as this forcing notion is weakly homogeneous, for every first order sentence ψ in the language of set theory with

parameters from $\mathbb{V}$, $\mathbb{V}[G_1] \models \psi$ iff $\mathbb{V}[G_2] \models \psi$ for any two generic sets G_1 and G_2. Hence we may write $\mathbb{V}^{coll(\mu,\aleph_0)} \models \psi$ meaning $\mathbb{V}[G] \models \psi$ for any generic G. See [Kan03, Proposition 10.19].

Definition 5.1. For a cardinal μ, let $L_\mu = \{<\} \cup \{P_i \mid i \in \mu\} \cup \{Q_j \mid j \in \mu\}$ where P_i are unary predicates and Q_j binary relation symbols. let $\mathbf{K}_\mu$ be the class of complete first order theories T in a language $L_T = \{<\} \cup \{P_i \mid i \in u_T\} \cup \{Q_j \mid j \in v_T\} \subseteq L_\mu$ equipped with a function $f_T : v^2 \to v$ such that:

- The theory T says that $<$ is a linear order; the sets P_i are nonempty and disjoint; the sets Q_j are nonempty and disjoint; $Q_j(x,y) \vdash x < y$; *additivity* of T: for all $x < y < z$, $Q_{j_1}(x,y) \wedge Q_{j_2}(y,z) \vdash Q_{f_T(j_1,j_2)}(x,z)$; the formula $P_i(x)$ isolates a complete type for $i \in u_T$; the formula $Q_j(x,y)$ isolates a complete type for $j \in v_T$; the isolated types are dense in T, and for any (equivalently, some) countable atomic model M of T in $\mathbb{V}^{coll(\mu,\aleph_0)}$, the sets P_i^M and Q_j^M form a partition of M, $<^M$ respectively.

Remark 5.2. Suppose that $T \in \mathbf{K}_\mu$. Then for every $n < \omega$, if a formula of the form $\bigwedge_{i<n} Q_{j_i}(x_i, x_{i+1})$ is consistent, then it isolates a complete type. Indeed, it is enough to show that this is true in a countable atomic model M of T in $\mathbb{V}^{coll(\mu,\aleph_0)}$. So let $\bar{x} = (x_0, \ldots, x_n)$ and $\bar{y} = (y_0, \ldots, y_n)$ be finite increasing tuples from M such that $Q_{j_i}^M(x_i, x_{i+1})$ and $Q_{j_i}^M(y_i, y_{i+1})$ hold for all $i < n$. Then, as Q_{j_i} isolate complete types, and as atomic models are homogeneous, there are automorphisms f_i of M which take x_i, x_{i+1} to y_i, y_{i+1}. Let

$$f = f_0 \restriction (-\infty, x_1] \cup f_1 \restriction (x_1, x_2] \cup \ldots \cup f_{n-1} \restriction (x_{n-1}, \infty).$$

Then, as the Q_j's form a partition of $<^M$, it follows that f is an automorphism of M by the additivity of T. It follows that these types are dense in T.

Now note that an equivalent definition to Definition 5.1 can be obtained by replacing the additivity requirement, the requirement that the isolated types are dense, and the requirement that the P_i's and Q_j's form a partition of a countable atomic model (after the collapse) by asking that formulas of the form $\bigwedge_{i<n} Q_{j_i}(x_i, x_{i+1})$, if consistent, isolate a complete type, and that types of such forms, as well as $P_i(x)$ are dense in T (we should also allow formulas of the form $P_i(x) \wedge x = y$, etc, to be completely formal).

For notational simplicity it is useful to write $Q(a,b) = j$ for $a \neq b \in M \models T$ when $j \in v_T$ is the unique element such that $(a,b) \in Q_j^M$ or $(b,a) \in Q_j^M$, and similarly $P(a) = i$ if $a \in P_i^M$.

We define two special subclasses of $\mathbf{K}_\mu$.

Definition 5.3. Let $\mathbf{K}_\mu^+$ be the class of theories $T \in \mathbf{K}_\mu$ such that for any $j \in v_T$ there is an $L_{\mu^+,\omega}$-formula $\psi_j(x,y)$ in the language $\{P_i \mid i \in u_T\} \cup \{<\}$ such that for any countable atomic model M of T in $\mathbb{V}^{coll(\mu,,\aleph_0)}$, $\psi_j^M = Q_j^M$. (After the collapse, ψ_j is an $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-formula.)

Let $\mathbf{K}^*_\mu$ be the class of theories $T \in \mathbf{K}_\mu$ such that for any $j \in v_T$ there is an $L_{\mu^+,\omega}$-formula $\psi_j(x,y)$ in the language $\{<\}$ such that for any countable atomic model M of T in $\mathbb{V}^{coll(\mu,,\aleph_0)}$, $\psi_j^M = Q_j^M$.

As usual, this definition does not depend on the choice of atomic model or the generic extension. Note that $\mathbf{K}_\mu \supseteq \mathbf{K}^+_\mu \supseteq \mathbf{K}^*_\mu$.

Remark 5.4. If $T \in \mathbf{K}^*_\mu$, then for every $i \in u_T$, there is a formula φ_i in $L_{\mu^+,\omega}$ such that in any countable atomic model M of T in $\mathbb{V}^{coll(\mu,,\aleph_0)}$, $\varphi_i^M = P_j^M$. Why? Suppose that M is a countable atomic model of T in $\mathbb{V}^{coll(\mu,\aleph_0)}$. Let $a \in P_i^M$, and let $\Psi_a(x)$ be the Scott formula which isolates the complete $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-type of a in $\{<\}$ (in the context of Proposition 2.5, this is $\phi_{\beta,a}$). As P_i isolates a complete type, this formula does not depend on a, so we define $\varphi_i = \Psi_a$. In addition, φ_i does not depend on M, and hence by 2.2,φ_i is in $\mathbb{V}$. By definition, $P_i^M \subseteq \varphi_i^M$ for any such M. It remains to show that if $a \models \varphi_i$ in some such M, and $a \in P_{i'}^M$ then $i' = i$. If not, by choice of φ_i, there is some $b \models \varphi_i$ in P_i^M, and suppose that $a < b$. Let $j \in v_T$ be such that $(a,b) \in Q_j^M$. Since$a$ and b satisfy φ_i, there is an automorphism σ of $M \restriction \{<\}$ taking a to b. Then by the definition of $\mathbf{K}^*_\mu$, $(\sigma(a), \sigma(b)) \in Q_j^M$. However Q_j isolates a complete type, so it must be that $Q_j(x,y) \vdash P_{i'}(x)$ and hence $b = \sigma(a) \in P_{i'}^M$ so $i = i'$.

The following theorem translates the question of finding a linear order with the isomorphism property which is not realized in $\mathbb{V}$ to the question of finding a theory in $\mathbf{K}^+_\mu$ without an atomic model, as in Section 3. It seems that in order to produce a counterexample, $\mathbf{K}^+_\mu$ allows more freedom than $\mathbf{K}^*_\mu$ (as it contains more theories), but in the end they are equivalent in this sense.

Theorem 5.5. *Let μ be some cardinal. The following are equivalent:*

1. *For any forcing notion P such that $P \not\Vdash \left|(\check{\mu}^+)\right| < \omega_1$ and any P-name $\dot{\tau}$ such that P forces $\dot{\tau}$ to be a linear order on ω, if $(P, \{<\}, \dot{\tau})$ has the isomorphism property, then for some linear order $I = (X, <) \in \mathbb{V}$, $P \Vdash \check{I} \cong \dot{\tau}$.*
2. *Every theory $T \in \mathbf{K}^+_\mu$ has an atomic model of size μ.*
3. *Every theory $T \in \mathbf{K}^*_\mu$ has an atomic model of size μ.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Suppose that $T \in \mathbf{K}^+_\mu$. Let $P = coll(\mu, \aleph_0)$ be the Levy collapse of μ to $\aleph_0$. As the isolated types are dense in T, P forces that T has a countable atomic model, so let $\dot{M}$ be a name for it. Now let us work in $\mathbb{V}^P$, and let $M \in \mathbb{V}[G]$ be a countable atomic model of T with universe ω.

Let us introduce the following notation. For a family $\{(X_i, <_i) \mid i \in I\}$ of linear orders, where I is linearly ordered by $\prec$, we let $\sum_{i \in I} X_i$ be the linear order whose universe is the disjoint union of the sets X_i and the order $<$ is such that $< \restriction X_i = <_i$ and for $i \neq j$, $a \in X_i$ and $b \in X_j$, $a < b$ iff $i \prec j$.

Denote by $\mathbb{Q}$ the usual dense linear order on the rational numbers. Define the linear order $X_M = (X, <)$ as the sum of linear orders $\sum_{a \in M} X_a$ where for each $a \in M$, $X_a = \mathbb{Q} + (P(a) + 2)$ (recall that $P(a)$ is the unique $i \in u_T$ — now a countable ordinal — such that $a \in P_i$. It is well defined because in an atomic model, the P_i's form a partition). For instance, if $a \in P_0$, then $X_a = \mathbb{Q} + \{0, 1\}$.

Let $\dot{\tau}$ be a P-name for $X_{\dot{M}}$. First we claim that $(P, \{<\}, \dot{\tau})$ has the isomorphism property. This follows easily from the fact that after the collapse, if $M \cong N$ are two countable atomic models of T, then $X_M \cong X_N$ (as linear orders). Now, $P \times P \Vdash \dot{M}_1 \cong \dot{M}_2$ (where, as usual, $\dot{M}_1$ is the $P \times P$-name $\dot{M}[G_1]$ where $G_1 \times G_2$ is a generic for $P \times P$, etc.), so in $\mathbb{V}^{P \times P}$, $\dot{\tau}_1 \cong \dot{\tau}_2$ as desired.

By (1), there is some linear order $I = (X, <) \in \mathbb{V}$ such that $P \Vdash \check{I} \cong \dot{\tau}$. Now we want to recover an atomic model of T from I.

Let $X_0 \subseteq X$ be the set of all $x \in X$ with a densely ordered open neighborhood without endpoints, and let $X_1 = X \backslash X_0$. For each $x \in X_1$, there are unique $x_0 = x_0(x) \leq x \leq x_1(x) = x_1$ such that:

- $x_0 < x_1$; $x_0, x_1 \in X_1$; every point in $[x_0, x_1)$ has a successor; for every $z < x_0$ there is some $y \in (z, x_0) \cap X_0$, and similarly, for every $x > x_1$ there is some $y \in (x_1, x) \cap X_0$.

Why? This sentence is absolute and since it is true after the collapse, it is also true in $\mathbb{V}$. We now know that after the collapse, the closed interval $[x_0, x_1]$ is well-ordered and has the same order type as $i+2$ for some countable ordinal $i \in u_T$, so in $\mathbb{V}$ the same is true (except that now $i < \mu^+$).

There is a natural convex equivalence relation $\sim$ on X_1: two points are equivalent if they define the same x_0 and x_1. Let $Y = X_1/\sim$, and define an L_T-structure N with universe Y such that

$$P_i^N = \{[x]_\sim \in Y \mid \mathrm{otp}[x_0(x), x_1(x)] = i + 2\},$$

and such that Q_j^N is defined using the $L_{\mu^+,\omega}$-formula promised in Definition 5.3.

Now, by absoluteness of the construction, N is also the result of this construction in $\mathbb{V}^P$, and there, as $I \cong X_M$, we get that $M \restriction \{<\} \cup \{P_i \mid i \in u_T\}$ is isomorphic to $N \restriction \{<\} \cup \{P_i \mid i \in u_T\}$, and hence $N \cong M$ and we are done.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Immediate as $\mathbf{K}^*_\mu \subseteq \mathbf{K}^+_\mu$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Suppose that $(P, \{<\}, \dot{\tau})$ has the isomorphism property. Let G be a generic set for P, and let $M = \dot{\tau}[G]$. For each $a \in M$, let $\Psi_a(x)$ be as in Remark 5.4 and similarly define $\Psi_{a,b}(x, y)$ for $a < b$ in M. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{\Psi_a \mid a \in M\}$ and let $\mathcal{V} = \{\Psi_{a,b} \mid a < b \in M\}$. By Corollary 2.2, $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are in $\mathbb{V}$ (although here they are sets of $L_{\mu^+,\omega}$-formulas) and their size is at most μ by the assumption on P. Enumerate (in $\mathbb{V}$) $\mathcal{U} = \{\psi_i \mid i \in u\}$ and $\mathcal{V} = \{\xi_j \mid j \in v\}$ where u, v are subsets of μ.

Let $L = \{<\} \cup \{P_i \mid i \in u\} \cup \{Q_j \mid j \in v\}$. Let M' be an expansion of M to L defined by $P_i^{M'} = \{x \in M \mid x \models \psi_i\}$ and $Q_j^{M'} = \left\{(x, y) \in <^M \,\middle|\, (x, y) \models \xi_j\right\}$. Note that M' is atomic and

that formulas of the form $\bigwedge_{i<n} Q_{j_i}(x_i, x_{i+1})$, if consistent, isolate a complete type, and the same is true for formulas of the form $P_i(x)$ (this follows from the fact that any automorphism of M is also an automorphism of M').

Let $T = Th(M')$. By Corollary 2.2, $T \in \mathbb{V}$. We claim that $T \in \mathbf{K}^*_\mu$. By Definition 5.1 and Remark 5.2, $T \in \mathbf{K}_\mu$ and $T \in \mathbf{K}^*_\mu$ as witnessed by ξ_j. By (3), T has an atomic model $N' \in \mathbb{V}$. Hence in $\mathbb{V}[G]$, $N' \cong M'$. It follows that $N \restriction \{<\}$ is isomorphic to M in $\mathbb{V}[G]$. □

5.2. More on $\mathbf{K}^*_\mu$ and $\mathbf{K}^+_\mu$.

Definition 5.6. Suppose that $T \in \mathbf{K}_\mu$. Suppose that E is some equivalence relation on v_T. By induction on $\alpha < \mu^+$, define equivalence relations $\sim_T^{E,\alpha}$ as follows:

For $\alpha = 0$, $\sim_T^{E,0} = E$.

For α limit, $j_1 \sim_T^{E,\alpha} j_2$ iff for all $\beta < \alpha$, $j_1 \sim_T^{E,\beta} j_2$.

For $\alpha = \beta + 1$, $j_1 \sim_T^{E,\alpha} j_2$ iff $j_1 \sim_T^{E,\beta} j_2$ and there exists a countable atomic model $M \in \mathbb{V}^{coll(\mu,\aleph_0)}$ of T such that:

- For any $(a,b) \in Q^M_{j_1}$, $(a',b') \in Q^M_{j_2}$, and for any $c \in M \setminus \{a,b\}$ there is some $c' \in M \setminus \{a',b'\}$ such that abc and $a'b'c'$ have the same order type, and $Q(a,c) \sim_T^{E,\beta} Q(a',c')$ and $Q(c,b) \sim_T^{E,\beta} Q(c',b')$.
- The same, replacing j_1 with j_2.

Note that reflexivity of $\sim_T^{E,\alpha}$ follows from the fact that $Q_j(x,y)$ isolates a complete type in T (and from the fact that a countable atomic model is homogeneous).

Let us say that an equivalence relation E on v_T is *additive* if for all j_1, j_2 and j'_1, j'_2 in v_T such that $Q_{j_1}(x,y) \wedge Q_{j_2}(y,z)$ and $Q_{j'_1}(x,y) \wedge Q_{j'_2}(y,z)$ are both consistent, $j_1 \; E \; j'_1 \wedge j_2 \; E \; j'_2 \Rightarrow f_T(j_1,j_2) \; E \; f_T(j'_1,j'_2)$. Say that E is *edge preserving* if whenever $x < y, x' < y'$ and $Q(x,y) \; E \; Q(x',y')$ then $\mathrm{tp}(x/\emptyset) = \mathrm{tp}(x'/\emptyset)$ and $\mathrm{tp}(y/\emptyset) = \mathrm{tp}(y'/\emptyset)$.

Claim 5.7. Suppose that E is some equivalence relation on v_T, where $T \in \mathbf{K}_\mu$.

(1) For all $\alpha < \mu^+$, $\sim_T^{E,\alpha+1} \subseteq \sim_T^{E,\alpha}$. Hence for some $\alpha = \alpha(T,E)$, $\sim_T^{E,\alpha+1} = \sim_T^{E,\alpha}$.
(2) Definition 5.6 does not depend on the choice of a generic set G for $coll(\mu,\aleph_0)$ because $coll(\mu,\aleph_0)$ is weakly homogeneous (see above).
(3) If E is additive, then so is $\sim_T^{\alpha,E}$ for any $\alpha < \mu^+$.
(4) In Definition 5.6, we can do any of the following changes and get an equivalent definition:
   (a) Replace "there exists a countable atomic model" (which exists since the isolated types are dense), by "for any countable atomic model" (as any two are isomorphic).
   (b) Replace the bullets by "for some $(a,b) \in Q^M_{j_1}$, $(a',b') \in Q^M_{j_2}$ the following holds. For any $c \in M \setminus \{a,b\}$, there is some $c' \in M \setminus \{a',b'\}$ such that abc and $a'b'c'$ have the same order type, $Q(a,c) \sim_T^{E,\beta} Q(a',c')$ and $Q(c,b) \sim_T^{E,\beta} Q(c',b')$ and vice versa."

(c) If E is edge preserving and additive, then we can replace $M\setminus\{a,b\}$ and $M\setminus\{a',b'\}$ by the intervals (a,b) and (a',b') in the bullets.

Proof. (1) is clear, (2) is explained in the claim. For (3) use induction on α and the fact that T is additive. (4) (a) is explained above, (4) (b) follows by the fact that Q_j isolates a complete type and by homogeneity, (4) (c) is proved by induction on α using (3). □

As usual, assume that $T\in\mathbf{K}_\mu$. Given an equivalence relation E on v_T, say that E is *definable* in some sub-language $\{<\}\subseteq L'\subseteq L_T$ if for every E-class $C\subseteq v_T$ there is some $L_{\mu^+,\aleph_0}$-formula ψ_C in L' such that if $M\in\mathbb{V}^{coll(\mu,\aleph_0)}$ is a countable atomic model of T, then $\psi_C^M=C^M=\bigcup\{Q_j^M\mid j\in C\}$.

Proposition 5.8. *Suppose that $T\in\mathbf{K}_\mu$ and E is some equivalence relation on v_T. Assume that E is definable in some sub-language $\{<\}\subseteq L'\subseteq L$. Then for every $\alpha<\mu^+$, $\sim_T^{E,\alpha}$ is also definable in L'.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on $\alpha<\mu^+$. For $\alpha=0$ this is given.

Suppose $\alpha>0$ is a limit. Then for each $\sim_T^{E,\alpha}$-class C there is a sequence $\langle D_\beta\mid\beta<\alpha\rangle$ of $\sim_T^{E,\beta}$-classes, such that $C=\bigcap_{\beta<\alpha}D_\beta$, and for any countable atomic model $M\in\mathbb{V}^{coll(\mu,\aleph_0)}$, $(x,y)\in C^M$ iff $(x,y)\in D_\beta^M$ for all $\beta<\alpha$.

Suppose $\alpha=\beta+1$. Then for each $\sim_T^{E,\alpha}$-class C there is an $\sim_T^{E,\beta}$-class D and a set A of tuples of the form (r,D_1,D_2) where r is an order type of three points, and D_1, D_2 are $\sim_T^{E,\beta}$-classes such that for any countable atomic $M\in\mathbb{V}^{coll(\mu,\aleph_0)}$, $(x,y)\in C^M$ iff $(x,y)\in D^M$ and:

- For every $z\in M\setminus\{x,y\}$, there is some triple $(r,D_1,D_2)\in A$ such that $\mathrm{otp}(xyz)=r$, $(x,z)\in D_1^M$ (if $x<z$, otherwise we ask that $(z,x)\in D_1^M$) and $(z,y)\in D_2^M$ (if $z<y$, else same as before) and for every triple $(p,E_1,E_2)\in A$ there is some $w\in M\setminus\{x,y\}$ such that $p=\mathrm{otp}(xyw)$, $(x,w)\in E_1^M$ (if $x<w$, else see above) and $(w,y)\in E_2^M$ (if $w<y$, else see above).

Note that these parameters (D, A) belong to $\mathbb{V}$ and depend only on C and not and the choice of atomic model or generic set. By induction this can be written in $L_{\mu^+,\aleph_0}$ (as there are at most μ-many classes) using L' (since $<\in L'$). □

Let $T\in\mathbf{K}_\mu$. Let E_0 be the following equivalence relation on v_T: $j_1\ E_0\ j_2$ iff for some $i_1,i_2\in u_T$, $Q_{j_1}(x,y)\vdash P_{i_1}(x)\wedge P_{i_2}(y)$ and $Q_{j_2}(x,y)\vdash P_{i_1}(x)\wedge P_{i_2}(y)$.

Let E_1 be the trivial equivalence relation on v_T, i.e., $E_1=v_T\times v_T$.

Claim 5.9. Suppose $T\in\mathbf{K}_\mu$. The relations E_0 and E_1 are definable in the languages $L_0=\{<\}\cup\{P_i\mid i\in u_T\}$ and $L_1=\{<\}$ respectively and are additive. The relation E_1 is edge preserving.

Proof. The first assertion is easy to check. The second follows from the fact that $P_i(x)$ isolates a complete type. □

As $E_0 \subseteq E_1$, it follows that $\sim_T^{E_0,\alpha} \subseteq \sim_T^{E_1,\alpha}$ for all $\alpha < \mu^+$.

Remark 5.10. We can also define "intermediate" equivalence relations between E_0 and E_1, taking into account a specific subset s of u_T, and then define $j_1 \; E_s \; j_2$ iff $P(a) \equiv_s P(a')$ and $P(b) \equiv_s P(b')$ whenever $(a,b) \in Q_{j_1}$ and $(a',b') \in Q_{j_2}$ where $\equiv_s$ is the equivalence relation on u_T whose classes are $\{s\} \cup \{\{i\} \mid i \in u_T \backslash s\}$. In this notation $E_1 = E_{u_T}$ and $E_0 = E_\emptyset$. These are less important but worth mentioning.

Proposition 5.11. *Let μ be a cardinal. Then $\mathbf{K}^+_\mu$ is the class of theories $T \in \mathbf{K}_\mu$ such that $\sim_T^{E_0,\alpha(T,E_0)}$ is equality (see Claim 5.7 (1)). Similarly, $\mathbf{K}^*_\mu$ is the class of theories $T \in \mathbf{K}_\mu$ such that $\sim_T^{E_1,\alpha(T,E_1)}$ is equality.*

Proof. The proofs for $\mathbf{K}^+_\mu$ and $\mathbf{K}^*_\mu$ are similar, so we will do the $\mathbf{K}^*_\mu$ case.

Suppose that $T \in \mathbf{K}^*_\mu$ as witnessed by ψ_j for $j \in v_T$. Suppose $j_1 \sim_T^{E_1,\alpha(T,E_1)} j_2$. Let M be a countable atomic model of T after the collapse, and let $(a,b) \in Q^M_{j_1}$, $(a',b') \in Q^M_{j_2}$. Let F be the set of all finite order-preserving partial functions g from M to M which map a,b to a',b' and such that for $x < y$ in its domain, $Q(x,y) \sim_T^{E_1,\alpha(T,E_1)} Q(g(x), g(y))$. Then F is a back and forth system by the choice of $\alpha(T,E_1)$ and by the additivity of $\sim_T^{E_1,\alpha}$ (see Claim 5.7 (3)) and hence there is an automorphism of $M \restriction \{<\}$ taking a,b to a',b', so both (a,b) and (a',b') satisfy ψ_{j_1} and ψ_{j_2}. But the Q_j's are disjoint, and ψ_j defines Q_j in M, so $j_1 = j_2$.

Conversely, by Proposition 5.8, for every $j \in v_T$, there is some formula ψ_j in $L_{\mu^+,\omega}$ which defines (in the sense of said proposition) the class of j in $E_{1,\alpha(T,E_1)}$ which is just $\{j\}$. □

5.3. **An example of a theory in $\mathbf{K}_\mu$ without an atomic model.**

Theorem 5.12. *Let $\mu = \left(2^{\aleph_0}\right)^+$. There is some $T \in \mathbf{K}_\mu$ without an atomic model.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{Q}^+$ be the set of positive rationals, and let $v_T = \{(i_1, i_2, (n,q)) \mid i_1, i_2 \in \mu, n < \omega, q \in \mathbb{Q}^+\}$. Let $L = L_T = \{<\} \cup \{P_i \mid i \in \mu\} \cup \{Q_j \mid j \in v_T\}$.

Let $P = coll(\mu, \aleph_0)$, and let G be a generic set. Work in $\mathbb{V}[G]$, where μ is countable. Let M be the following structure. Its universe X is the set of all functions η from ω to $\mathbb{Q}$ such that for some $n < \omega$, $\eta(m) = 0$ for all $m \geq n$ (so that X is countable). The order is: $\eta_1 > \eta_2$ iff for $n = \min\{k \mid \eta_1(k) \neq \eta_2(k)\}$, $\eta_1(n) > \eta_2(n)$. As an order, this is just a dense linear order with no endpoints.

Choose P^M_i in a dense way. More precisely, choose P^M_i in such a way that each P^M_i is dense and unbounded from above and below, and such that the P_i's form a partition of M. It is easy to

see that this is possible to construct "by hand", or one can see this as the countable atomic model of the model completion of the theory of linear order and infinitely many colors.

Now we must define $Q_{i_1,i_2,(n,q)}$ where $i_1, i_2 \in \mu$, $n \in \omega$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}^+$. Suppose $\eta_1 < \eta_2$, then $(\eta_1, \eta_2) \in Q^M_{i_1,i_2,(n,q)}$ iff $\eta_1 \in P^M_{i_1}$, $\eta_2 \in P^M_{i_2}$, $n = \min\{k \mid \eta_1(k) \neq \eta_2(k)\}$ and $q = \eta_2(n) - \eta_1(n)$ (which must be > 0). Note that the Q_j's form a partition of $<^M$.

As above, write $P^M(\eta) = i$ to denote that $\eta \in P^M_i$ and similarly $Q^M(\eta_1, \eta_2) = j$.

Claim 5.13. The theory of M is additive: given $j_1, j_2 \in v_T$ there is a unique $j_3 = f_{Th(M)}(j_1, j_2)$ such that $Q_{j_1}(x,y) \wedge Q_{j_2}(y,z) \vdash Q_{j_3}(x,z)$.

Proof of claim. There are several cases to check. Suppose that $j_1 = (i_1, i_2, (n,q))$, $j_2 = (k_1, k_2, (m,r))$. Then, if $n > m$, then $j_3 = (i_1, k_2, (m,r))$, and if $n < m$, $j_3 = (i_1, k_2, (n,q))$. If $n = m$, then $j_3 = (i_1, k_2, (n, q+r))$. □

Claim 5.14. Suppose that N is an L-structure (perhaps in some transitive model of set theory containing $\mathbb{V}^P$) with universe X such that $<^N = <^M$, the sets P^N_i form a partition of X for $i \in \mu$ such that P^N_i is dense and unbounded, and Q^N_j defined in the same way as Q^M_j for $j \in v_T$. Then $M \cong N$. Moreover, M is atomic, and the formulas of the form $P_i(x)$, $\bigwedge_{i<n} Q_{j_i}(x_i, x_{i+1})$ isolate complete types which are dense in $Th(M)$.

Proof of claim. Note that $Th(N)$ is also additive, and that $f_{Th(N)} = f_{Th(M)}$. We do a back and forth argument. Suppose that $g : M \to N$ is a partial finite isomorphism from some finite subset $s \subseteq X$ to $g(s)$, and we are given $\eta \in X$ which we want to add to its domain. Enumerate $s = \{\eta_i \mid i < n\}$ where $\eta_0 < \ldots < \eta_{n-1}$, and suppose $\eta_i < \eta < \eta_{i+1}$ (where $-1 \leq i < n$ and $\eta_{-1} = \infty$, $\eta_n = \infty$). Let $g(s) = \{\nu_i \mid i < n\}$ where $\nu_0 < \ldots < \nu_{n-1}$. By additivity, it is enough to find some $\nu \in X$ such that $\nu_i < \nu < \nu_{i+1}$, $P^N(\nu) = P^M(\eta)$, $Q^M(\eta_i, \eta) = Q^N(\nu_i, \nu)$ and $Q^M(\eta, \eta_{i+1}) = Q^N(\nu, \nu_{i+1})$. This follows easily by observing that for all $i < \mu$ and any $\eta \in X$ and $n < \omega$, there is some $\eta' \in X$ such that $\eta \restriction n = \eta' \restriction n$ and $P(\eta') = i$: consider $\eta \restriction n \frown \bar{0}$ (where $\bar{0}$ is just an infinite sequence of zeros), and $\eta \frown \langle 1 \rangle \frown \bar{0}$. Find η' between these two.

The moreover part follows from the previous paragraph, the fact that $Q_j(x,y) \vdash P_{i_1}(x) \wedge P_{i_2}(y)$ for some $i_1, i_2 < \mu$ and the additivity. □

Let $\dot{\tau}$ be a P-name for M. By Claim 5.14, $(P, L, \dot{\tau})$ has the isomorphism property, and hence $T = Th(M) \in \mathbb{V}$. We also get that $T \in \mathbf{K}_\mu$.

Claim 5.15. The theory T has no atomic model in $\mathbb{V}$.

Proof of claim. Suppose N is an atomic model of T. As N is atomic, by the second claim, $\left\{Q^N_j \mid j \in v_T\right\}$ partition $<^N$. Define a coloring of increasing pairs, $c : <^N \to \omega \times \mathbb{Q}$ by $c(x,y) = (n,q)$ iff $Q^N(x,y) = (i_1, i_2, (n,q))$ for some $i_1, i_2 < \mu$. By Erdös-Rado, for some infinite set $A \subseteq N$,

and some n, q, $c(x, y) = (n, q)$ for all $x < y$ in A. Since A is infinite, we can find $x < y < z$ in A. But T forbids a triple $x < y < z$ with

$$(n, q) = c(x, y) = c(y, z) = c(x, z)$$

— a contradiction. □

□

Problem 5.16. What more can be said about theories from $\mathbf{K}_\mu$, $\mathbf{K}^+_\mu$ and $\mathbf{K}^*_\mu$? When do they have atomic models? We saw that for $\mu = \left(2^{\aleph_0}\right)^+$, there is a theory in $\mathbf{K}_\mu$ without an atomic model. Is the same true for some μ and $\mathbf{K}^+_\mu$ (equivalently, by Theorem 5.5, $\mathbf{K}^*_\mu$)?

Remark 5.17. After this paper has appeared online, it came to our attention that a recent paper by Knight, Montalban and Schweber [KMS14] deals with similar notions and proves some similar results, though for different purposes and with different methods. Their notion of a generically presentable structure is very close to our isomorphism property (see Definition 1.1). There is some overlapping between the two papers (for instance our Corollary 4.3 and their Theorem 3.12). Their proofs also use Scott sentences, but our approach is different (they use Fraïssé limits and we use atomic models), and the focuses of the two papers are completely different. Two other recent papers, one by Baldwin, Friedman, Koerwien and Laskowski [BFKL14], and another by Larson [Lar14] have some overlapping with [KMS14] (they all give a new proof of a result of Harrington regarding Vaught's conjecture using different methods).

References

[BFKL14] John T. Baldwin, Sy D. Friedman, Martin Koerwien, and Michael C. Laskowski. Three red herrings around Vaught's conjecture. 2014. preprint, `http://homepages.math.uic.edu/~jbaldwin/pub/redherrings`.

[Hod93] Wilfrid Hodges. *Model Theory*, volume 42 of *Encyclopedia of mathematics and its applications*. Cambridge University Press, Great Britain, 1993.

[Jec03] Thomas Jech. *Set theory*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. The third millennium edition, revised and expanded.

[Kan03] Akihiro Kanamori. *The higher infinite*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2003. Large cardinals in set theory from their beginnings.

[Kei71] H. J. Keisler. *Model theory for infinitary logic*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1971.

[KMS14] Julia Knight, Antonio Montalban, and Noah Schweber. Computable structures in generic extensions. 2014. preprint, `arXiv:1405.7456`.

[Kni78] Julia F. Knight. Prime and atomic models. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 43(3):385–393, 1978.

[Kue78] David W. Kueker. Uniform theorems in infinitary logic. In *Logic Colloquium '77 (Proc. Conf., Wrocław, 1977)*, volume 96 of *Stud. Logic Foundations Math.*, pages 161–170. North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1978.

[Lac72] A. H. Lachlan. A property of stable theories. *Fund. Math.*, 77(1):9–20, 1972.

[Lar14] Paul B. Larson. Scott processes. 2014. preprint, arXiv:1407.1920.

[LS93] M. C. Laskowski and S. Shelah. On the existence of atomic models. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 58(4):1189–1194, 1993.

[Mar02] David Marker. *Model Theory: An Introduction*. Springer, 2002.

[New90] Ludomir Newelski. More on locally atomic models. *Fund. Math.*, 136(1):21–26, 1990.

[She90] Saharon Shelah. *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, volume 92 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, second edition, 1990.

[TZ12] Katrin Tent and Martin Ziegler. *A course in model theory*, volume 40 of *Lecture Notes in Logic*. Association for Symbolic Logic, La Jolla, CA; Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.

Itay Kaplan, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram, Jerusalem 91904, Israel

E-mail address: kaplan@math.huji.ac.il

URL: https://sites.google.com/site/itay80/

Saharon Shelah, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram, Jerusalem 91904, Israel

Saharon Shelah, Department of Mathematics, Hill Center-Busch Campus, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

E-mail address: shelah@math.huji.ac.il

URL: http://shelah.logic.at/